

STATE OF MICHIGAN
BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

* * * * *

In the matter of the application for Commission)
approval of an interconnection agreement)
between U.S. Network Corporation on)
behalf of USN COMMUNICATIONS, INC., and)
Ameritech Information Industry Services)
on behalf of AMERITECH MICHIGAN.)
_____)

Case No. 11239

DISSENTING OPINION OF COMMISSIONER JOHN C. SHEA


(Submitted on January 28, 1997 concerning order issued on same date.)

I am not able to join in the approval of the accompanying order. As I have stated previously, see, November 1, 1996 Dissenting Opinion in Case No. U-11138, the means to reach the result embodied in the accompanying order cannot, as the majority states, arise under federal law. Rather, the Michigan Telecommunications Act, 1991 PA 179, as amended by 1995 PA 216, MCL 484.2101 et seq.; MSA 22.1469(101) et seq., (the "MTA") is the only authority that should control this proceeding.

The MTA quite clearly spells out the necessary process for approving interconnection agreements. Under Section 303(2) of the MTA, the Commission has authority to approve interconnection arrangements between basic local exchange service providers. Indeed, Section 305(1)(b) forbids a basic local exchange service provider from refusing to interconnect. Section 352 sets forth the prices for interconnection. Section 203(1) of the MTA authorizes the Commission to issue orders only after a contested case held pursuant to the Michigan Administrative Procedures Act, MCL 24.201 et seq.; MSA 3.560(101) et seq. Even if the MTA

were read to permit interconnections to be approved without a contested case, either as a result of the agreement of the parties or as the result of alternative dispute resolution, see, Section 203a of the MTA, some showing is necessary that the agreement does indeed comport with the MTA. No contested case was convened in this matter, no recommended settlement pursuant to Section 203a has been presented and no joint application has been filed by the parties showing compliance with the MTA. Thus, there is no record upon which the Commission can fashion an order approving this agreement. Instead, this matter has reached conclusion under a federal mandate that provides significantly less examination of the agreement than the MTA and is at odds with the due process provisions of the Michigan Administrative Procedures Act.

Failure to observe these mandatory provisions of state law renders this proceeding -- and the interconnection agreement at issue -- fatally flawed. Thus, while settlements between adverse parties should be encouraged, and while the interconnection agreement, as the majority intends to approve it, could be found after a contested case to be in the public interest, I must reluctantly dissent.



John C. Shea, Commissioner

STATE OF MICHIGAN

BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

* * * * *

AT&T COMMUNICATIONS OF MICHIGAN, INC.)

Petition for Arbitration of Interconnection Rates, Terms)	Case No. U-11151
and Conditions and Related Arrangements with Michigan)	Case No. U-11152
Bell Telephone Company d/b/a Ameritech Michigan.)	


NOTICE OF DECISION OF ARBITRATION PANEL

The attached Proposal for Decision is being issued and served on all parties of record in the above matter on October 28, 1996.


Exceptions, if any, must be filed with the Michigan Public Service Commission, P.O. Box 30221, 6545 Mercantile Way, Lansing, Michigan 48909, and served on all other parties of record on or before November 7, 1996, or within such further period as may be authorized for filing exceptions. An original and 15 copies of this document are necessary to meet proper filing requirements, as well as proof of service on all other parties of record. No replies are being provided for.

At the expiration of the period for filing of exceptions, an Order of the Commission will be issued in conformity with the attached Proposal for Decision and will become effective unless exceptions are filed seasonably or unless the Proposal for Decision is reviewed by action of the Commission. To be seasonably filed, exceptions must reach the Commission on or before the date they are due.


THE ARBITRATION PANEL



Robert E. Hollenshead



Ann R. Schneidewind



Louis R. Passariello

October 28, 1996
Lansing, Michigan
dp

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	History of Proceedings	1
II.	Discussion	4
III.	Disputed Issues	6
	Issue 1 - What prices should be set for Reciprocal Compensation, Transiting, Unbundled Network Elements/Combinations, Collocation and Structures (poles, ducts, conduits and right-of-way)?	6
	Issue 2 - What discount from retail prices should be set for the services AT&T purchases from Ameritech for resale?	23
	Issue 3 - Whether the contract should impose mutual and reciprocal obligations upon both parties with respect to matters other than reciprocal compensation arrangements for transport and termination? Whether AT&T must offer reciprocal collocation arrangements when collocation has been requested from Ameritech?	27
	Issue 4 - Whether Ameritech should be required to carry AT&T's transit traffic?	29
	Issue 5 - What interconnection points and methods shall be used for interconnection? .	31
	Issue 6 - Whether AT&T may place hubbing equipment in collocated space in an Ameritech central office?	32
	Issue 7 - Should standards of performance be specified now or be deferred to an Implementation Plan?	33
	Issue 8 - Should late payment charges be assessed for delays in the reporting of access usage data? What time limits should be imposed on the reporting of errors in access usage data?	35
	Issue 9 - Whether AT&T should have unbundled access to AIN (Advanced Intelligent Network) triggers? Whether a joint AT&T/Ameritech study team should investigate the technical aspects of this issue?	36
	Issue 10 - Should Ameritech offer the Unbundled Element Platform without Operator Services as a standard offering to AT&T?	38

Issue 11 - What is the appropriate language to be included in schedules on unbundled access and collocation not specifically addressed elsewhere in this Decision of the Arbitration Panel?	39
Issue 12 - What advance written notification of Operations Support System changes should be required?	40
Issue 13 - Whether Ameritech will provide one or separate electronic interfaces for Pre-ordering, Ordering, and Provisioning functions?	41
Issue 14 - What technical standards will apply to Ameritech's electronic interfaces for Pre-ordering, Ordering and Provisioning?	42
Issue 15 - Whether the implementation plan under this Agreement should establish a process for disaster recovery	42
Issue 16 - Whether AT&T will have the ability through an electronic interface to identify a local service provider or long distance provider when needed as proposed in Schedule 10.13.2-2?	43
Issue 17 - What contract language should be adopted with regard to the provisioning of Migration-As-Is order?	44
Issue 18 - What technical standards should apply to the electronic interfaces for Maintenance and Repair?	44
Issue 19 - Should Ameritech, at AT&T's request, be required to recourse charges on 900 and 976 calls to Information Service providers?	45
Issue 20 - Whether Ameritech's central office power supply to AT&T should be provided in the manner requested by AT&T?	46
Issue 21 - Whether Ameritech should offer Route Indexing as an interim number portability option?	46
Issue 22 - Whether AT&T Customer Listings should be included in Ameritech's Yellow Pages Directories as well as its White Pages Directories? Whether information regarding the manner in which customers may contact AT&T for telephone service should be included in Ameritech's directories? Whether Ameritech should distribute directories to AT&T customers at no additional charge?	48

Issue 23 - Whether Ameritech or Ameritech's publisher should be responsible for direct communications with AT&T in connection with the provisioning of directory listings and directories for AT&T retail customers?	49
Issue 24 - Does Ameritech's duty to permit access to rights-of-way include the duty to permit access to real property owned or leased by Ameritech?	50
Issue 25 - Should Ameritech be entitled to deny access to a pole, duct, conduit or right-of-way (referred to jointly as Structure) on the basis of lack of capacity where Ameritech has not taken all reasonable steps, including modification to its Structure to expand its capacity?	52
Issue 26 - Does Ameritech's duty to permit AT&T access to Structure it owns or controls include the duty to provide access to Structure owned or controlled by Ameritech and located on a public right-of-way?	53
Issue 27 - What types of equipment may be attached to Ameritech's Structure?	54
Issue 28 - If Ameritech denies a request of AT&T for access to Ameritech's Structure must Ameritech provide written reason for such denial not later than 45 days from such request?	55
Issue 29 - If Ameritech and AT&T are unable to agree on a reasonable cost or timeframe for completion of access related work, should AT&T or its contractors be permitted to conduct field survey work and make ready work so as to permit AT&T to establish its own intervals for establishing access?	56
Issue 30 - What language should be adopted concerning AT&T's installation and maintenance responsibility for work performed on Structures by AT&T's workmen or contractors?	57
Issue 31 - Whether Ameritech should be permitted to limit the number and scope of AT&T's access requests being processed at any time?	58
Issue 32 - If Ameritech moves, replaces or changes the location, alignment or grade of its conduit or poles to which AT&T has attached equipment and/or facilities will AT&T have to bear the expense of relocating its equipment and/or facilities?	58
Issue 33 - Whether Ameritech's or AT&T's proposed § 16.16 of the Agreement concerning inspections of AT&T's attachments to Ameritech's Structures should be adopted?	60

Issue 34 - Whether interconnection of AT&T ducts and conduits with Ameritech's manholes can be denied where modification of Ameritech's Structures to accommodate AT&T's request for access is possible?	61
Issue 35 - Whether AT&T's proposed additional language for § 16.24 of the contract concerning abandonments, sales or disposition of Ameritech's Structures is appropriate?	61
Issue 36 - Should AT&T's proposed Supplier Quality Management System be adopted? Whether the contract should include specific timetables for the deployment plan and an enforcement mechanism, including penalty provisions for failure to meet time requirements or other deficiencies in performance?	62
Issue 37 - Whether AT&T and Ameritech should be required to provide customer payment history information to each other?	63
Issue 38 - Whether Ameritech's or AT&T's proposed Agreement § 20.2.4(iv) concerning disclosure and use of Proprietary Information should be adopted?	64
Issue 39 - Whether a three- or five-year term should be included in the Agreement approved by the Commission? Whether the Commission or the Dispute Resolution Process should be invoked to resolve disputes regarding a future contract?	65
Issue 40 - Whether Ameritech's proposed language for Article XXIV regarding non-severability of the rates, terms and conditions of the Agreement should be adopted?	66
Issue 41 - Whether Ameritech's or AT&T's Agreement § 25.1(a) concerning indemnity rights should be adopted?	66
Issue 42 - Whether AT&T's proposed additional language for § 12.7 concerning indemnification for losses related to interconnection with other collocated carriers should be adopted?	67
Issue 43 - Whether Ameritech's or AT&T's Agreement Article XXVI concerning limitation of liability should be adopted?	68
Issue 44 - Whether Ameritech's proposed § 6.5.2 to the Agreement limiting liability for losses for services rendered under Article VI of the Agreement should be adopted?	70

Issue 45 - Whether the Agreement should include an alternate dispute resolution mechanism for handling disputes?	71
Issue 46 - Whether AT&T's additional proposed language for § 24.1 of the Agreement should be adopted?	72
Issue 47 - In the event that this Commission or the FCC rejects any portion of the Agreement and the parties after 30 days are unable to renegotiate new terms, should the dispute be referred to the dispute resolution process established in this decision as proposed by AT&T in its additional proposed language for § 29.1 of the Agreement?	73
Issue 48 - In the event the parties are unable to agree upon provisions of an Ameritech/AT&T interconnection tariff, should the dispute resolution process be used to establish such tariff provisions as recommended by AT&T's additional proposed language for § 29.2 of the Agreement?	74
Issue 49 - In the event that proxy rates are established in this proceeding and rates are later adjusted by the FCC or this Commission, what will be the effective date for the new rates? In the event that rates are changed due to revisions to the Act or FCC rules, what will be the effective date for the new rates?	74
Issue 50 - If any final and nonappealable legislative, regulatory, judicial or other legal action other than an amendment to the Act materially affects the ability of a party to perform any material obligation under the Act and the parties are unable to negotiate a new provision or provisions within 30 days should this dispute be referred to the Agreement's dispute resolution process as recommended by AT&T's proposed additional language for § 29.4 of the Agreement?	75
Issue 51 - Whether all of the benefits provided under this Agreement to AT&T and Ameritech should be provided to their affiliates if Ameritech or AT&T desire to conduct their respective business operations through affiliates? . . .	76
Issue 52 - Whose proposed Agreement language should be adopted concerning the administration of gross receipts taxes?	77
Issue 53 - Whether AT&T's proposed additional language set forth at § 30.11 of the Agreement should be adopted? This additional language would prevent Ameritech from representing in advertising and marketing that Ameritech is providing services to AT&T or that AT&T is reselling Ameritech's services.	77

Issue 54 - Should the Agreement permit AT&T to obtain any interconnection service or network element which is made available to any other party by Ameritech?	78
Issue 55 - Whether certain miscellaneous Agreement provisions concerning disputes should be adopted or rejected?	79
IV. Conclusion and Recommendation	81

STATE OF MICHIGAN
BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

* * * * *

AT&T COMMUNICATIONS OF MICHIGAN, INC.)

Petition for Arbitration of Interconnection Rates, Terms)	Case No. U-11151
and Conditions and Related Arrangements with Michigan)	Case No. U-11152
Bell Telephone Company d/b/a Ameritech Michigan.)	
_____)	

DECISION OF ARBITRATION PANEL

I.

HISTORY OF PROCEEDINGS

On February 27, 1996, AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc. (AT&T) requested that Michigan Bell Telephone Company d/b/a Ameritech Michigan (Ameritech) enter into negotiations pursuant to §§ 251 and 252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the Act), 47 USC §§ 251 and 252, to establish an interconnection agreement with Ameritech. During the months that followed, the parties began negotiations regarding a generic agreement involving the networks in the various states in which both companies (or their affiliates) operate -- namely, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio and Wisconsin. As defined in the Act, Ameritech is an Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier (ILEC). AT&T is a "requesting telecommunications carrier" within the meaning of 47 USC 252(a) of the Act, a "telecommunications carrier" as defined by 47 USC 153(a)(44) of the Act, and a "local exchange carrier" (LEC) as defined by 47 USC 153(a)(26) of the Act.

On June 10, 1996, Ameritech submitted to the Michigan Public Service Commission (Commission), and the Commission's counterparts in the other four states in the Ameritech region,

requests for mediation pursuant to § 252(a) of the Act. These mediations were not successful in reaching agreement on a substantial number of issues.

On August 1, 1996, AT&T filed a Petition for Arbitration with the Commission, seeking arbitration of the terms, conditions and prices for interconnection and related arrangements from Ameritech, pursuant to § 252(b) of the Act and in accordance with the procedure adopted by the Commission in its Order dated July 16, 1996 in Case No. U-11134. AT&T's Petition was assigned Case No. U-11151 by the Commission. At the same time, AT&T filed proposed direct testimony and exhibits.

On August 2, 1996, Ameritech filed a Petition for Arbitration requesting that the Commission arbitrate issues relating to collocation of AT&T equipment on Ameritech premises and pricing for such collocation, AT&T's costs for local traffic termination and AT&T's obligations under § 251(b) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. Ameritech's Petition was assigned Case No. U-11152. Thereafter, Case Nos. U-11151 and U-11152 were consolidated into a single arbitration proceeding.

On August 2, 1996, an arbitration panel (the Panel) was appointed consisting of Administrative Law Judge Robert E. Hollenshead and Commission Staff members Ann R. Schneidewind and Louis R. Passariello.

On August 14, 1996, the parties met with the Panel to discuss procedural and scheduling matters. At this meeting, the Panel established the controlling dates for each activity required by the parties, the Panel and the Commission. In addition, the Panel requested the parties establish a common framework for addressing disputed issues. Following the initial meeting, each party met separately with the Panel to discuss the issues being presented for resolution and the position of the

parties with respect to these issues.

On August 23, 1996, AT&T filed a Joint Motion with TCG to sever Ameritech's cost study from the arbitration proceeding and to have it considered in a separate proceeding. Ameritech filed its reply to the Joint Motion on August 30, 1996. As of the date of issuance of this Decision of the Arbitration Panel, the Commission has not acted on this motion.

On August 26, 1996, Ameritech filed its Response to AT&T's Petition and proposed testimony and exhibits in support of its positions. On August 27, 1996, AT&T filed its Response to Ameritech's Petition denying that the issues Ameritech attempted to raise by its Petition are properly arbitrable under the Act and asked that Ameritech's Petition be dismissed. AT&T's Response to Ameritech's Petition also requested arbitration of all terms and conditions of an interconnection agreement between the parties.

On September 3, 1996, each party submitted requests for additional information. On September 4, 1996, the Panel approved certain of the requests submitted by the parties and also, on September 4, 1996, notified the parties of those requests to which responses were required. Each party filed responses on September 10, 1996. However, the Panel thereafter determined that Ameritech's response was incomplete and directed Ameritech to file further information. Ameritech thereafter filed this requested information.

On September 13, 1996, AT&T submitted its "Resolved and Disputed Contract Language" (also referred to as AT&T's Red Line Agreement) which set forth all terms agreed to by the parties as well as each party's proposed contract language for all disputed portions of the contract.

On September 17, 1996, each party submitted a Proposed Decision of the Arbitration Panel

(PDAP). On September 17, 1996, Ameritech also submitted a redline agreement along with a list of annotations concerning differences in the contracts.

On September 24, 1996, the parties made oral presentations to the Panel in support of their respective PDAPs. On September 25, 1996, the parties rebutted each others PDAP presentations.

On October 1, 1996, AT&T submitted supplemental information regarding resolved issues and an amended PDAP. On October 2, 1996, Ameritech submitted a "red-lined" version of its PDAP which indicated the sections and arguments which could be removed because the parties had resolved the applicable issues.

On October 2, 1996, the parties jointly submitted a "Double-Redlined" version of the proposed interconnection agreement (dated October 1, 1996) including both resolved contract language and proposed language of both AT&T and Ameritech in disputed areas.

II.

DISCUSSION

Section 252(b) of the Act and § 204 of the Michigan Telecommunications Act (MTA) confer jurisdiction on the Commission to arbitrate disputes involving the rates, terms and conditions of agreements between telecommunications carriers respecting interconnection, services or network elements. AT&T, having been unable to reach an agreement with Ameritech, petitioned the Commission to arbitrate an agreement in accordance with § 252(b) of the Act, and § 204 of the MTA.

On July 16, 1996, the Commission, in Case No. U-11134, (In the matter, on the Commission's own motion, to establish a procedure for arbitration under the federal Telecommunications Act of

1996), issued an order to provide a framework for arbitration and to establish a procedure to be followed for arbitration conducted pursuant to § 252 of the Act. This procedure provided for appointment of a three-member arbitration panel consisting of an Administrative Law Judge and two technical staff persons.

On August 8, 1996, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) released its First Report and Order in CC Docket Nos. 96-98 and 95-185 which discussed the Act, stated positions of various parties on certain sections of the Act, stated the FCC's position concerning these sections of the Act and established certain rules pursuant to the Act. The FCC's August 8, 1996 Order will hereafter in this Decision of the Arbitration Panel be referred to as the FCC Order. The rules issued pursuant to the FCC Order amend (for purposes of this proceeding) subpart 5 of Part 1 of Title 47 of the Code of Federal Regulations (47 C.F.R. 1.1401 et seq.) and add a new Part 51 of Title 47 of the Code of Federal Regulations (47 C.F.R. 51.1 et seq.).

On August 6, 1996, the FCC released an order in CS Docket No. 96-166 where it discussed Section 703 of the Act which addresses, among other things, pole attachments. The FCC's August 6, 1996 order (which is hereafter referred to as the FCC Pole Attachment Order) also amended and added to the FCC's existing pole attachment rules. These pole attachment rules amend subpart J of Part 1 of Title 47 of the Code of Regulations (47 C.F.R. 1.1407 et seq.).

On September 27, 1996, the FCC released its Order on Reconsideration in CC Docket Nos. 96-98 and 95-185. In its September 27 order the FCC established a flat-rated default proxy range for the non-traffic sensitive costs of basic residential and business line ports associated with the unbundled local switching element. In addition, the FCC clarified that, because its First Report and

Order concluded that the local switching element includes dedicated facilities, the requesting carrier is thereby effectively precluded from using unbundled switching to substitute for switched access services where the loop is used to provide exchange access to the requesting carrier and local service by the incumbent LEC.

On September 27, 1996, the Eighth Circuit of the United States Court of Appeals in Docket Nos. 96-3321, 96-3406, 96-3410, 96-3414, 96-3416, 96-3418, 96-3424, 96-3430, 96-3436, 96-3444, 96-3450, 96-3453, 96-3460, 96-3507, 96-3519 and 96-3520 issued a temporary stay of the FCC's August 8, 1996 First Report and Order. On October 15, 1996, the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals dissolved its September 27, 1996 temporary stay and replaced it with a stay of the FCC's pricing rules and the "pick and choose" rule contained in the FCC's First Report and Order until the court issued its final decision on the merits. The Court specifically indicated that its stay applied only to 47 C.F.R. 51.501-51.515, 47 C.F.R. 51.601-51.611, 47 C.F.R. 51.701-51.717 and 47 C.F.R. 51.809.

All references to contract language and contract sections discussed refer to the October 2, 1996 jointly submitted "Double-Redlined" version of the proposed interconnection agreement filed by Ameritech and AT&T in this proceeding.

III.

DISPUTED ISSUES

ISSUE 1

What prices should be set for Reciprocal Compensation, Transiting, Unbundled Network Elements/Combinations, Collocation and Structures (poles, ducts, conduits and right-of-way)?

DECISION:

Based on its determination regarding the preliminary review of AT&T's and Ameritech's cost study methodologies, the requirements of the Act and this Commission's arbitration procedures delineated in Case No. U-11134, the following interim prices are adopted by this Panel.

1) **Reciprocal Compensation** - The Panel finds AT&T's proposed price of 0.2 cents for end office termination along with its tandem routed rate of 0.06 cents should be adopted. The panel finds Ameritech's proposed prices of 0.6181 cents for end office termination and 0.201 cents for tandem switching excessive, being three times higher than the prices proposed by AT&T. It is noted that Ameritech's proposed prices are also significantly higher than its pending Total Service Long Run Incremental Cost (TSLRIC) rates of 0.3647 cents for end office termination and 0.0744 cents for tandem switching filed in Case No. U-11156.

2) **Transiting** - The Panel is of the opinion that transiting consists of two rate elements: tandem switching and the transport function. While the Panel adopts AT&T's proposed tandem switching rate of .06 cents as an interim rate, the Panel opts for the FCC's shared transport access rates as discussed below. The Panel was unable to determine whether the single rate of 0.12 cents proposed by AT&T or the pre-1997 transiting rate of 0.2 cents proposed by Ameritech properly weigh the switching and transport elements. The Panel therefore adopts two separate interim rates for transiting, the tandem switching rate of 0.06 cents proposed by AT&T and the FCC shared transport access rates discussed elsewhere herein as the appropriate interim rates to be applied to transiting traffic.

3) **Unbundled Loops** - The panel finds AT&T's proposed prices for unbundled loops for

Zones A, B and C of \$7.53, \$8.93 and \$10.37, respectively, should be adopted. In the Panel's view, Ameritech's proposed prices for Zones A, B and C of \$15.61, \$18.48 and \$21.33 are unreasonably high. It is noted that Ameritech's proposed loop prices significantly exceed its pending TSLRIC loop rates of \$9.31, \$11.84 and \$14.67 filed in Case No. U-11156. Given this Commission's adopted arbitration procedures, the Panel finds AT&T's proposed prices to be a more reliable approximation of TSLRIC.

4) **Local Switching** - There exists a wide discrepancy in the port prices proposed by AT&T and Ameritech in this proceeding. Ameritech's proposed price of \$10.22 is approximately 20 times greater than the \$.54 price proposed by AT&T. Based on this Commission's arbitration procedures of choosing one party's position, the Panel finds AT&T's proposed price of \$.54 represents a closer approximation of TSLRIC and should therefore be adopted. It is noted that Ameritech's proposed price of \$10.22 is not remotely close to its TSLRIC rate of \$2.12 pending before the Commission in Ameritech Advice No. 2438B.

The panel also adopts AT&T's proposed local switching charges of 0.65 cents for the initial minute and 0.22 cents for each additional minute rather than Ameritech's proposed price of 0.5808 cents per minute of use. It is noted that Ameritech's proposed price of 0.5808 significantly exceeds its pending TSLRIC local switching charges of 0.54 cents for the first minute and 0.17 cents for each additional minute pending in Ameritech Advice No. 2438B mentioned above. The panel finds AT&T's proposed local switching charges to be a reasonable approximation of TSLRIC.

5) **Tandem Switching** - The Panel adopts AT&T's proposed price of 0.06 cents rather than

Ameritech's proposed price of 0.1415. Based on the Panel's belief that AT&T's cost methodology more closely approximates TSLRIC, the Panel finds AT&T's proposal appropriate for this element.

6) Dedicated Transport, Switched Transport, Signaling and Database Services, Operator and Directory Services and Collocation - For those network elements and services listed above, items 1 through 5, (with the exception of the transport function associated with transiting) the Panel has followed the Commission's arbitration procedures and chosen one party's position over the other. For the network elements and services discussed in this section, the Panel believes the existing FCC interstate access rates should be adopted. Each of these services includes numerous rate elements a number of which are under investigation by the FCC. These interstate services are the same as will be utilized in the process of local interconnection. There is no justification on the record in this proceeding to establish rates which differ from those established by the FCC for these services. Therefore, the rates already included in Ameritech's toll access tariff should be utilized for these local interconnection services.

7) Structures - Neither Ameritech nor AT&T have included a complete list of proposed prices for pole attachment and other services related to right-of-way access. The Panel therefore does not establish specific prices for right-of-way access herein. Both parties propose generally that prices be set consistent with formulas included in § 224 of the Act in a proceeding to be initiated by the FCC next year. Until that time Ameritech proposes prices set forth in its Pricing Schedule be adopted but has failed to include those prices in the

Schedule. AT&T proposes that rates established by the FCC next year apply retroactively to services utilized until then (§ 16.18 of the Contract).

It is the Panel's belief that under § 361 of the MTA, providers may establish the rates, terms and conditions for attachments under the terms of a formula established in that section. If AT&T disputes the rates that are ultimately established by Ameritech in this area, a complaint may be filed with this Commission for resolution.

The federal Act provides that in the area of right-of-way access, a state may exercise preemptive authority to establish conditions of access (§ 224(c)) of the Act; ¶ 1239 of the FCC Order). Michigan certified to the FCC its regulation regarding right-of-way a number of years ago and this authority has not been affected by the enactment of the MTA. The Panel also notes, however, that there is little difference between the rate setting formulas in § 224(e) of the Act and § 361(3) of the MTA. At this time the Panel adopts and references MTA authority in regard to right-of-way pricing. It is the Panel's belief that if a dispute arises when specific prices are established by Ameritech, AT&T may invoke procedures available to it under state law to resolve any conflict.

In addition, both AT&T and Ameritech proposed prices for Busy Line Verification, Busy Line Verification Interrupt and various nonrecurring charges. The Panel has determined that insufficient information exists on the record for the Panel to make an informed decision. It is the view of the Panel that if one price has to be chosen, then AT&T's proposed price is appropriate since the Panel has found that AT&T's proposed prices have been more consistent with this Commission's TSLRIC methodology.

For those unbundled network elements proposed by Ameritech but not identified by AT&T (e.g. non basic loops and ports), the Panel has concluded that no decision is required. The issue before us is the price of elements which AT&T has requested. The Panel is not obligated to respond to additional issues brought up by Ameritech in its response to AT&T's petition. If disputes arise as to these network elements, the parties will have to raise the issue with the Commission at a later date.

Along the same line, Ameritech, in response to AT&T's petition, identifies services and prices for billing and collection, cross connect, service coordination and 9-1-1, which AT&T did not address in its petition. As indicated previously above, the issues are defined by AT&T's petition. If disputes arise concerning prices for these services, the parties will have to present the issue to the Commission at a later date if resolution between the parties is not possible.

In regard to unbundled platforms, AT&T's proposed prices are the only prices on the record. Thus the Panel's decision is limited to AT&T's position. Ameritech took the position in its response to AT&T's petition that unbundled combinations should be requested through the bona fide request process and therefore did not propose any prices. Since that time, the parties have negotiated and Ameritech has agreed to provide three combinations as standard offerings but has proposed no specific prices. Under the Commission's arbitration procedure, the Panel is limited to selecting one party's position. Therefore AT&T's combination prices are adopted.

REASONS FOR DECISION:

The proposed pricing schedules of AT&T and Ameritech are the most contested issue in this arbitration proceeding. The pricing standard established by the Act is contained in § 252(d) which includes the requirements for the pricing of three types of services: interconnection and network

elements, transport and termination and wholesale prices for telecommunications services. Wholesale pricing will be discussed separately below. In regard to the first two items the Act provides as follows:

"(d) PRICING STANDARDS. -

(1) INTERCONNECTION AND NETWORK ELEMENT CHARGES. -
Determination by a State commission of the just and reasonable rates for the interconnection of facilities and equipment for purposes of subsection (c)(2) of section 251, and the just and reasonable rate for network elements for purposes of subsection (c)(3) of such section -

(A) shall be -

(i) based on the cost (determined without reference to a rate-of-return or other rate-based proceeding) of providing the interconnection or network element (whichever is applicable), and

(ii) nondiscriminatory, and

(B) may include a reasonable profit.

(2) CHARGES FOR TRANSPORT AND TERMINATION OF TRAFFIC.-

(A) IN GENERAL. - For the purposes of compliance by an incumbent local exchange carrier with section 251(b)(5), a State commission shall not consider the terms and conditions for reciprocal compensation to be just and reasonable unless -

(i) such terms and conditions provide for the mutual and reciprocal recovery by each carrier of costs associated with the transport and termination on each carrier's network facilities of calls that originate on the network facilities of the other carrier; and

(ii) such terms and conditions determine such costs on the basis of a reasonable approximation of the additional costs of terminating such calls.

(B) RULES FOR CONSTRUCTION. - This paragraph shall not be construed -

(i) to preclude arrangements that afford the mutual recovery of costs through the offsetting of reciprocal obligations, including arrangements that waive mutual recovery (such as bill-and-keep arrangements); or

(ii) to authorize the Commission or any State commission to engage in any rate regulation proceeding to establish with particularity the additional costs of transporting or terminating calls, or to require carriers to maintain records with respect to the additional costs of such calls."

In its First Report and Order in CC Dockets 96-98 and 95-185 issued August 8, 1996, the

FCC delineated, among other things, the regulations which would apply to implementing these pricing provisions of the Act. In summary, the FCC adopted a so-called Total Element Long Run Incremental Cost methodology (TELRIC) to be utilized in pricing interconnection services. Included in these regulations were specified "proxies" for the pricing of a number of network elements as well as for transport and termination. The FCC reasoned that given the short timeframes permitted in the Act for arbitration resolution, proxy prices could be adopted for an interim period of time. This would permit states a longer period of time to analyze detailed cost studies for interconnection services in order to determine compliance with the TELRIC requirements.

As discussed earlier, the Eighth Circuit of the U.S. Court of Appeals has issued a stay of the FCC's pricing rules contained in its August 8th Order, including its TELRIC methodology and the suggested proxies. The Eighth Court has scheduled argument regarding the merits of the cases for January 1997. The FCC has indicated it will appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court the decision to stay its Order.

The MTA and orders by this Commission also contain pricing requirements relevant to interconnection services. In November 1995 amendments to the MTA were enacted including requirements regarding the pricing of local service interconnection. The pricing standard included in the MTA is contained in Section 352 (MCL 484.2352) as follows:

"Sec. 352. (1) Until January 1, 1997, the rates of a provider of basic local exchange service for interconnection under this article shall be at the provider's total service long run incremental cost of providing the service. After January 1, 1997, the rate for interconnection shall be just and reasonable as determined by the commission."

The Commission's (TSLRIC) methodology was originally delineated in Case No. U-10620. In Case

No. U-10860, the Commission required Ameritech to submit cost studies to permit certain interconnection services to be priced at TSLRIC levels as required by the MTA. The components addressed in that order were unbundled loops, unbundled ports, local call termination and interim number portability. Applications and tariffs filed in response to the orders are now pending before the Commission.

In this proceeding, the pricing alternatives which are pending before this Panel from AT&T and Ameritech are based on the FCC's TELRIC methodology. Whether the stay of the FCC's Order in this regard will be continued or whether the proposed methodology and proxies will be finally upheld by the Courts next year is, of course, unknown at this time. However, timeframes contained in § 252 of the Act compelling state commissions to act on requests for arbitration remain in effect.

Therefore, taking account of state and federal laws, TELRIC and TSLRIC cost methodologies, the positions of AT&T and Ameritech which have been advanced in this proceeding, and the Commission's arbitration guidelines, the Panel has reached its conclusions regarding the pricing issues in this case. The Panel's conclusions are based on five fundamental considerations. First, the Panel believes that the statutory pricing requirements for local interconnection services delineated above and included in state and federal laws are essentially the same. It is important to note that these statutory requirements are the fundamental basis upon which this Panel and ultimately the Commission must rely in reaching its pricing determinations in this proceeding. These requirements remain in place and are unaffected by the recent actions of the U.S. Court of Appeals. Second, a specific discussion of the FCC's TELRIC methodology is included below as well as this Panel's determinations regarding AT&T's and Ameritech's compliance with that methodology as